

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/653,247

Applicant(s)

ALCORN, JOHN WILLIAM

Examiner

Tuan A Vu

Art Unit

2124

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tuan A Vu.

(3) _____.

(2) Siegesmund, Rudolf (37720).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 05 January 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: claims 14, 15.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Examiner has pointed out that some clarity issue needs to be addressed concerning a step limitation in claims 14 and 15. Attorney has indicated that claim 12 has omitted a step limitation which is to be the cause for claims 14 and 15 being unclear. Examiner thought an Examiner's amendment can remedy to this issue but found out that effecting such Amendment would be inappropriate for a first action rejection. Hence Examiner will proceed on with examining the claims exactly as they are submitted because no further amendment could be entered. A rejection under USC 35 112 will be effected to identify issue as detected..